

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
**FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW MEXICO**

---

DEBORAH ROBINSON,

Plaintiff,

v.

Civil No. 05-1335

JUDITH SCHLOSSER, et al.,

Defendants.

**MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S**  
**MOTION TO AMEND MISTAKE**

THIS MATTER comes before the Court upon Plaintiff's Motion to Amend Mistake, filed January 18, 2006 (**Doc. 14**). Plaintiff, who is proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis, asserts that she has been unable to rent an apartment because Defendants have discriminated against her under several federal statutes, including the Fair Housing Act, 42 U.S.C.A. § 3604.

The Court construes Plaintiff's motion as one to correct a clerical error, namely, to amend her complaint in order to number paragraphs in sections IV, V and VI in her Complaint.

Requests for leave to amend requests for leave to amend pleadings should be liberally granted by the Court. Sooner Products Co. v. McBride, 708 F.2d 510, 511 (10th Cir. 1983). However, leave to amend pleadings may be denied when the amendment is untimely or when the amendment would be futile. Bauchman v. West High School, 132 F.3d 542, 559 (10th Cir. 1997).

Even if this were the kind of clerical error envisioned under Rule 60 (a), the Court finds that numbering the sections in the Complaint is entirely unnecessary, since it adds nothing in the

way of clarification of Plaintiff's claims. Plaintiff's Motion to Amend Mistake (**Doc. 14**) is therefore DENIED.<sup>1</sup>

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

---

<sup>1</sup> Given the Court's disposition of the motion, no response is necessary.